DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 446 HE 009 229

AUTHOR Rose, Clare; Nyre, Glenn F.
TITLE From Retrenchment to Renewal: Faculty Development and Innovation in the California State University and Colleges.
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 10p.; Address at the International Conference on Improving University Instruction (Heidelberg, W. Germany, May 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Innovation; *Faculty Development; Federal Aid; Financial Support; Foundation Programs; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Instructional Innovation; Research Projects; *State Colleges; *State Universities; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *California State University and Colleges; Multicampus Colleges

ABSTRACT

In the flush of the academic bull market of the 1960's a few perceptive writers called for a reexamination of higher education's mission, institutional goals, and the need to improve the quality of college and university instruction. But by and large these cries went unheard in the cacaphony of academic inertia. In the mid-70's a crisis in higher education has spawned major efforts at planned change throughout the country, and in California a fund was established for educational innovation, supported by state and private monies. In that state single-campus and multicampus projects have been willingly undertaken, and thousands of faculty and administrators have participated in related activities. There is increasing evidence that innovations instituted by faculty members with the assistance of this fund are stimulating other faculty to try out new teaching techniques. Centralization of the fund's administration in the office of the chancellor has contributed both efficiency and focus to the programs. However, several problems must be addressed for maximum impact in the future: assurance of special funding; the task of extending, refining, and institutionalizing innovation; and maintaining enthusiasm for innovation and the commitment to evaluation. An example of the California system's commitment to broad-based change and instructional improvement is the Center for Professional Development, established with system and federal funds to coordinate, guide, evaluate, and test alternative types of faculty development programs in the system. (MSE)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED144446

# From Retrenchment to Renewal: Faculty Development and Innovation in The California State University and Colleges

by
Clare Rose and Glenn F. Nyre
Center for Professional Development
Division of New Program Development and Evaluation
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University and Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Like most human beings, Americans are crisis-oriented. We do not gather our acorns in preparation for the future as squirrels do. Snug and secure in our own little world, we easily become complacent. We neither plan for the future nor anticipate change; but given a crisis we rally to surmount it. We fly by the seat of our pants and we treat cancerous problems with Band-Aids. No sooner has the crisis passed than we become sedentary again.

This condition, unfortunately, has been true in American higher education. Reveling in the flush of the academic bull market of the 1960's as masses of students knocked on the doors of academe, rich with research projects and a mobile faculty, higher education became complacent. Some lip service, and even some appropriate obeisance, was given to the need for innovation, reform, self-examination and self-renewal. A few voices were heard crying in the wilderness predicting the end of the baby boom, the impending dollar crunch, the folly of expansion for the sake of expansion and the potential glut of faculty. A few perceptive writers called for the need to examine our mission, our institutional goals and the necessity of improving the quality of instruction in our colleges and universities, but by and large, these cries fell on deaf ears in the cacaphony of academic inertia.

Nevertheless, public disenchantment with higher education, coupled with ever decreasing legislative support, placed higher education in a state of disarray. Acadamicians began speaking and writing of retrenchment, depression, reevaluation, and the need for planned change and development. In the 1970's we moved into a period which is generally described as "steady state" (a period of turbulence that might better be termed an "unsteady state"), as higher education faced shrinking and shifting enrollments, changing

HE 009229

Invitational address, International Conference on Improving University Instruction, Heidelberg, West Germany, May 8-11, 1975.

markets, an aging, "tenured in" faculty, the prospect of collective bargaining, the increased involvement of legislators and governors in the business of higher education, and above all, limited resources. The ivy-covered walls of academe had finally been rattled.

But, as we said at the outset, we are a crisis-minded people and we don't give up the ship easily. Neither has higher education. What should have begun years ago is beginning now. As some institutions have been forced to close their doors in bankruptcy, other institutions have begun institutional self-appraisals and self-renewal programs. Institutions are becoming increasingly involved in developing new approaches to resource allocation, intensive planning and program review and academic programs involving more than one campus. Although we do not have much experience upon which to draw in this area, academic plans and planning procedures are being emphasized, particularly with a thrust towards multi-campus orientation. Whatever the motivating factors, all of these efforts have the potential of increasing college and university effectiveness and improving the quality of teaching and learning. Underscoring all of these efforts has been the recognition of the need for programs of planned change.

While major efforts are being undertaken in these directions at institutions across the United States, the focus of our presentation is on the California State University and Colleges (CSUC), a system of 19 campuses which offers baccalaureate and master's degree level programs to some 280,000 students, employs about 16,000 faculty, and is dependent almost exclusively upon state appropriations for its operations. What follows is a chronicle of how this system developed and implemented a program for planned change, with particular emphasis on two highly unique and special programs, the Fund for Innovation and the Center for Professional Development.

## Establishment of the Fund for Innovation

In 1969 and 1970, the budgetary situation for the CSUC system was especially serious. In addition to an escalation of student/faculty ratios, faculty morale was at an all-time low particularly because salary increases were deleted from the 1970/71 budget by a State government far from enthusiastic about higher education in general, thus breaking an annual increase pattern for the first time since 1964. Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke responded to both the problems of fiscal and public support and the need to insure quality education to students with a statement to the system's Board of Trustees early in 1971, calling for a new approach to higher education that included such factors as time-shortened degree programs, greater attention to general education, reassessment of the meaning of the baccalaureate and needed fiscal and procedural reforms. In the following weeks, a Task Force on innovation was organized to initiate innovation and change with respect to substantive reforms in instructional methods, uses of student and faculty time and the process of learning.

Representative of System and campus administrations and the Statewide Academic Senate, the Task Force solicited proposals and ideas from the 19 member campuses which led to a definition of the specific tasks confronting the CSUC system: how to plan for, implement, and accomplish deliberate change to serve three basic objectives - faculty renewal in the broadest sense, improved learning opportunities through increased student options, and alternative approaches to instruction which would prove to be cost effective.

The results of the call for proposals, coupled with major interest on the part of the Carnegie Corporation, provided the stimulus which led to a recommended addition to the system's 1972-73 State Budget for a $600,000 Fund for Educational Development. Further interest on the part of the State's Department of Finance, the budget-building unit of the State government, and recommendations by the Office of the Legislative Analyst, the legal staff office charged with review and analysis of the Governor's Budget, led to a final appropriation of $1.7 million to support the Fund for Innovation and Improvement in the educational process.

## Organizational Structure

The second major step in the planned change program was the recognition that major staff reorganization was required within the Office of the Chancellor to implement a full scale program. The Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Task Force on Innovation, determined that better focus and attention for the Program for Innovation and Improvement could be achieved through the organization of a separate division within the Office of Academic Affairs which became, in 1972, the Division of New Program Development and Evaluation (NPD&E).

This division was assigned responsibility for developing the program to administer funds, coordinate the Carnegie-supported project (involving three campuses and a systemwide component) and encourage the development of educational media within the system. In addition to its initially assigned function, NPD&E soon became the focal point for the development of other innovation-focused proposals for system consideration.

## The Fund for Innovation Program

An essential element in the program was to stimulate competition of ideas among the campuses for implementation of broad educational objectives. Thus, the Task Force proposed that state funds be allocated through an open competition among the campuses. The idea of allocating funds on a per student basis or other similar rationale was discarded not only because it lacked the element of competition, but more importantly, because it was apparent that there were wide variations among campus faculties with respect to both interest and readiness to pursue innovative instructional projects.

Areas encompassed in the program are: 1) alternative methods of measuring achievement in degree subject areas; 2) reduction of student time spent in college classrooms and laboratories, including credit by examination and advanced placement; 3) reform of general education patterns; 4) increase in the overall efficiency of the academic program; 5) expanded use of educational media to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the college program; and 6) external degree/open university concepts.

After the call for proposals went out, the NPD&E staff visited campuses to explain the program and to encourage an optimum response. The reception on most campuses was favorable. On some it was apparent that faculty concerns about workload were coupled with a generally skeptical view of system-sponsored activities. Many faculty, as well as campus administrators, were not used to a system program which did not emphasize control, but rather, offered an opportunity to experiment. Nevertheless, the response to the call for proposals was encouraging; fifty-one campus and systemwide projects were funded, and some $1.5 million of the appropriation expended.

For the current academic year, 33 projects, totaling $1.4 million in grants, were selected from among 160 applications. The large majority of them are new efforts. In addition, over $200,000 of the Fund has been allocated to campuses to organize mini-grant programs where faculty engage in local competition for small grants to develop innovative courses, programs, methods or techniques. General faculty acceptance and enthusiasm for the program has grown, and questioning of its ultimate purpose and search for the "hidden agenda" has all but disappeared.

The kinds of projects supported changed focus during the second and third years of the program. There has been a shift towards multi-campus efforts, often requiring greater stimulus and coordination on the part of the staff. Although these efforts for the most part represent a shift in focus common to several other large college systems in the United States, in most instances the multi-campus efforts of the CSUC are outgrowths of projects which began on a single campus.

The move toward multi-campus projects has been undertaken in the belief that the dissemination of the outcomes of innovation--both product and process--can best be achieved through planned, organized efforts involving significant numbers of faculty working on learning problems common to several campuses.

Program Evaluation and Impact

Ongoing project evaluation has been, from the beginning, a multiple responsibility of project directors, the host campus, faculty observers, student participants, the system office, and in several instances, outside evaluation experts. In the first two years of the program, reports from projects indicated that nearly thirty-three thousand students benefited in one way or another from the

activities supported. Furthermore, over thirty-five hundred faculty and administrators have been involved with one or more activities of the Program. Many have attended conferences on implementing change, workshops on the uses of educational technology, including training programs on instructional applications of the computerized test item data bank, and seminars on the application of Personalized Systems of Instruction.

There is increasing evidence that innovations instituted by faculty members with the assistance of the Fund are stimulating other faculty to try out new teaching techniques. Many of the projects have tested some of the rhetoric of higher education, especially that of educational reform. We know that many students are neither motivated nor equipped to undertake full responsibility for their own learning, regardless of the quality of the learning assistance materials. Many of the projects have served to better define the variety of program structures required for students to succeed in the CSUC system institutions. We have accomplished, to a limited degree, some rethinking of the concept of general education and the meaning of the baccalaureate. We have spotlighted some system and campus policies which hinder flexibility and change.

Projects and programs stressing inter-campus cooperation, generally within the same discipline, have tended to bring faculty from sister institutions closer together to consider common problems, and some of the thought and effort which have gone into projects for innovation have borne fruit in other areas, such as the rapidly developing external degree program.

To a significant degree, important experience has been gained in the application of educational technology for instruction in off-campus settings, resulting in a better understanding of its limitations, as well as its excellent applications. Even more important, the Program has brought to the attention of the faculty a number of different ideas which they have since used in their courses and programs.

From an organizational standpoint, establishing a division with primary responsibility for the program within the Office of the Chancellor, has contributed significantly, not only in the project awards process and in monitoring and maintaining ongoing project evaluation, but also in serving as a focus for other activities which may be placed under the rubric of innovation. Having a specially designated staff has aided the system in developing systemwide meetings on innovation and change, seeking other areas for support, and serving as spokespersons for the program's objectives.

Despite these many indications of success, several problems need to be addressed for maximum impact in the future. First, of course, assurance of special funding availability is essential, yet difficult to obtain. Even if continued resources were assured, the task of extending, refining, and imbedding innovation remains. To extend innovation in the broadest sense involves a reallocation of resources. In higher education, this is difficult; in a state

system operating under close fiscal supervision, it is nearly impossible, particularly in the short run. The system has yet to come to grips fully with the manifold changes which may be needed to develop a viable strategy for achieving those changes.

In great measure, faculty-developed projects have concentrated on course reorganization, using self-paced media of one variety or another. Ways of assessing student learning independent of organized courses and measuring competencies at the major and degree level have yet to be extensively explored. Particularly in this latter instance, our faculty, like most other faculties in the United States, find it most difficult to move away from individual baccalaureate programs and disciplines, and to identify both what is important for a graduate to know, and how best to measure such knowledge.

The task of maintaining enthusiasm for innovation and the commitment to evaluation is difficult, and yet must be accomplished if the program is to continue to be effective. Already some waning of interest is taking place on campuses which at the outset exhibited the greatest enthusiasm. All of these factors underscore the need to maintain program flexibility and to generate among the faculty the motivation to continuously expand and refine their teaching roles, skills and objectives.

With respect to the latter point, the Fund has become increasingly aware that coupled with organizational change and a multi-campus thrust, more attention must be paid to faculty. The continued revitalization of faculty is critical if the program is to survive and prosper.

Faculty revitalization, however, must not be defined merely as instructional skill development. Rather, it must include a more encompassing approach to faculty development, incorporating a larger conceptual framework in which organizational and personal development are as essential as is instructional improvement. A comprehensive faculty development program is paramount if a program for planned change is to have maximum impact. The Center for Professional Development represents such an effort.

## The Center for Professional Development

No better evidence exists of NPD&E's commitment to broad based change and the improvement of instruction, and the recognition of its success by the federal government, than the Center for Professional Development, which was established as a combined effort of the U.S. Office of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Office of the Chancellor. Funded at approximately $.5 million over a three-year period, the Center has been established as an integral part of NPD&E to coordinate, guide, evaluate and test alternative types of faculty development programs in the CSUC system.

Although various types of "faculty development" activites have been attempted by colleges and universities during the last ten years or so, most of them have focused on rather specific topics such as recruitment procedures, use of sabbaticals and reduction of student/faculty ratios. Other efforts of faculty development have been largely cosmetic in nature, offering various types of instructional services for those few faculty who ask for help in upgrading their instructional skills and teaching performance. Few faculty development programs have represented comprehensive, active interventions in the teaching-learning process. As a result, there are few guidelines concerning either the kinds of faculty development programs which best improve the quality of instruction or the quality of life at the university or ways in which to best implement faculty development programs generally.

Each campus in the CSUC system is quite different, with its own distinctive needs, resources and goals. Thus, in keeping with the experimental and exploratory nature of this project, each has designed its own distinctive program representing a different approach to faculty development. The Center is coordinating the various individual efforts to form a comprehensive faculty development program, providing the necessary human and material resources to each individual campus. In this way, the campuses benefit from being part of a systemwide program learning more from the experiences of each other. A Policy Board, consisting of representatives from each of the 19 campuses, a member of the Statewide Academic Senate and two members of the Chancellor's Office, sets broad policy for the guidance of the Center, but each campus implements and operates its own programs.

Although it would have been ideal for each of the 19 member campuses of the system to adopt different models of faculty development to provide a comprehensive assessment of the relative merits of each, inevitable limitations of time and resources resulted in the selection of six prototypic campuses (through a proposal-and-review process) to participate intensively in the Center's program. This number is large enough to test several alternative strategies in different geographical settings, and still small enough to allow the Center's staff to concentrate its resources and energies in the most beneficial manner. At the same time, the Center is providing as much assistance as possible to each of the other campuses in the system, and efforts to develop a consortia focusing on faculty development are under way on four additional campuses.

Commitment to the Center and its programs has been made not only by the Office of the Chancellor, but by the participating campuses as well. Each of the six funded campuses has demonstrated both institutional support and financial commitment in a variety of ways. First, endorsement of the campus plans was obtained from the faculty senate at each institution. Secondly, and equally important, local campus administrations indicated support by providing at least one staff position as well as necessary support services, secretarial help, and office facilities. Both the senate support

and the financial commitment on the part of the administration were requirements for participation in the Center's program.

The six participating campuses range in size and location from the small, relatively isolated San Bernardino campus (129 faculty; 3,489 students) to a large metropolitan university in San Jose (900 faculty serving 26,794 students). As mentioned previously, the six campus programs represent different approaches to faculty development. San Jose is focusing on the development of a diagnostic self-appraisal instrument for faculty and resource materials relevent to each dimension of the instrument. The Northridge campus has established an Institute for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, providing released time for departmentally nominated faculty to address problems and issues about higher education in general and the Northridge campus in particular.

Chico is focusing on administrative development as part of a university-wide commitment to professional development and teaching improvement, assisting deans and department chairpersons in an exploration of ways by which they may facilitate faculty growth. The San Bernardino and Bakersfield campuses have each established programs to assist faculty in the development of effective instructional strategies. Fresno is undertaking a comprehensive approach that includes a review of its reward structure, its recruitment, tenure and promotion procedures, as well as faculty and administrative teaching improvement programs.

Each of the six campuses has designed an evaluation plan appropriate to its particular objectives, and each activity of both the Center and the campus programs will be evaluated separately and cummulatively. In addition, in its first year of activity the Center has conducted a number of training workshops for campus project staffs in order to develop leadership skills on the part of the individual project directors and to promote the exchange of ideas, experiences and problems among the campus staffs. In fact, one of the primary goals for the first year, in addition to the vast "tooling up" process necessary for a project of this size and complexity, was to create and maintain an environment conducive to change--an atmosphere of collaboration and mutual support in which the project staffs of the six campuses could work together on common problems and draw upon each other's skills and resources rather than relying on outside "experts" for help. We have strong evidence to date suggesting that we have accomplished this goal.

Project directors from San Jose, both skilled media specialists, have been asked to help evaluate the media resource facility on another of the Center's campuses. Still another campus team has visited two other campuses involved in the program. Each participating campus team is being invited to attend workshops for faculty held on other campuses, and the exchange of telephone calls and written materials among the six campus teams is increasing. Good relationships have been established with the project directors and their staffs, which should facilitate even more rigorous and productive efforts in the next two years.

Of course, all of the evidence is not yet in. In fact, we are currently in the process of undertaking a formal evaluation of our first year's efforts. Colleges and universities in general, and the CSUC system is no exception, properly aspire to excellence in teaching. The process of innovation, change, faculty development and evaluation within the system, however, must be continuous, or the momentum for change which has been generated is in danger of being lost. Efforts to improve our program, based on empirical data, are essential if the system is to remain viable and responsive.

During the last three years, the program for innovation has provided a systemwide focus and special support for faculty, staff and students to experiment and to apply the results of those experiments to the total college program. The Center for Professional Development will continue to encourage faculty to explore and examine their roles, their relationships with students and each other, their classroom teaching and their institutional environments. The Program for Innovation and the Center for Professional Development will continue to generate new goals responsive to changing conditions, continuously reassessing progress and modifying programs where necessary. The commitment to multiple foci, coupled with an absence of pre-determined notions about which teaching strategies or new programs should be encouraged and which should not, will be maintained. The Program has utilized and will continue to utilize a judicious evaluation system which recognizes the broad dimensions of teaching, and is sensitive to the many different types of campuses and different styles and kinds of instruction and instructional programs. Operating together within the structure outlined above, we hope to continue to demonstrate that a coordinated and significant effort for creative change and renewal can be carried out within a statewide system of higher education, and that the quality of instruction can be improved on all of our member campuses.